

### **Remarks**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 31, 2006 and the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review mailed on May 3, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 1, 7, 11 and 18 have been amended and claims 9, 10 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that a single communications element in the telecommunications system is operative to route the call pursuant to the corresponding wireless number based on the routing instructions received from the SCP. Support for this amendment may be found in Figure 3 and on page 12, lines 1-10. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 9-18 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery (US 6,011,975).

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 9-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Emery. Claims 9, 10, and 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims as moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies, in pertinent part, a communications element being operative to store the table, access the table to obtain the corresponding wireless number in response to receipt of the wireless extension in association with a call to the wireless unit, receive routing instructions from a service control point (SCP), and the communications element being further operative to route routing the call pursuant to the corresponding wireless number based on the routing instructions received from the SCP, wherein the communications element comprises a single element in the telecommunications system.

It is respectfully submitted that the Emery fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, Emery fails to disclose a single communications element which is operative to store a table, access the table to obtain the corresponding wireless number in response to receipt of the wireless extension in association with a call to the wireless unit, receive routing instructions from an SCP, and the communications element being further operative to route the call pursuant to the corresponding wireless number based on the routing instructions received from the SCP.

The Office Action alleges that Emery teaches a communications element which is made up of an ISCP and an STP. As discussed in Emery, the ISCP merely directs a communications system to terminate calls (e.g., by directing the system to route a list of potential callers to a mailbox – see column 21, lines 46-59). Thus, the ISCP as discussed in Emery fails to disclose storing a table, accessing the table to obtain the corresponding wireless number in response to receipt of the wireless extension in association with a call to the wireless unit, receive routing instructions from an SCP (the ISCP would have to receive instructions from itself in this instance), and route the call pursuant to the corresponding wireless number based on the routing instructions received from the SCP. The STP discussed in Emery serves to provide CCIS type data communications with ISCPs and SSPs (Service Switching Points) via a packet switched connection (see Col. 12, lines 33-48). CCIS data communications, as discussed in Emery, is a type of call processing method in which the local central office suspends the call and sends a query message, through one or more STPs, to the central office to which the called station is connected (i.e., a terminating central office – see Col. 14, lines 28-44) to determine whether or not the called station is busy. Thus, the STP discussed in Emery merely is utilized for sending query messages between central offices to determine whether one of the offices is busy during

call transport and thus does not perform a routing function (Emery discusses that routing is performed by the central office or SSP – see Col. 22, lines 30-34).

Based on the foregoing, neither the ISCP nor the STP of Emery discloses storing a table, accessing the table to obtain the corresponding wireless number in response to receipt of the wireless extension in association with a call to the wireless unit, receive routing instructions from an SCP, and route the call pursuant to the corresponding wireless number based on the routing instructions received from the SCP. Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the ISCP and the STP of Emery comprises a single communications element (as alleged in the Office Action), such an element would still fail to disclose each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 5, and 13-16 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 7 and 11 specify similar features as amended claim 1 discussed above, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 12 and 18 depend from amended claim 11, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(404) 954-5100

Date: June 4, 2007



/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III  
Reg. No. 47,299